

BEFORE THE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN RE COMPLIANCE WITH)	Report of Investigation
RCW 42.17)	
)	PDC CASE NO: 99-075
Dr. Janet Barry, Superintendent of)	
Issaquah School District)	
)	
Mary Waggoner, Director of)	
Communications, Issaquah SD)	
)	
Respondents)	
)	

I.

BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On March 8, 1999, Bill Elder filed a complaint with the Public Disclosure Commission (PDC) against the Issaquah School District alleging violations of RCW 42.17.130 for using the public facilities of an agency to promote a construction bond and a technology levy.
- 1.2 The Issaquah School District submitted three levy and bond elections to its citizens since February of 1998. The amounts and results of each of those elections are as follows:

Tuesday February 3, 1998:

<u>Approved:</u>	\$61.7 million four-year maintenance and operations levy
<u>Rejected:</u>	\$53.3 million school bond measure
	\$9.5 million technology levy
	\$1 million transportation levy

Tuesday May 19, 1998:

Approved: \$1 million transportation levy
Rejected: \$31.2 million 20-year construction bond
\$8.9 million technology levy

Tuesday April 27, 1999:

Approved: \$68.7 million 20-year construction bond
\$7.9 million technology levy

II.

SCOPE

- 2.1 Documents submitted by the Issaquah School District were reviewed.
- 2.2 Staff members of the Public Disclosure Commission conducted interviews under oath as follows:
 - Dr. Janet Barry, Superintendent of the Issaquah School District was interviewed at the district's administrative offices on June 15, 1999, and again on May 11, 2000. Chris Hirst, an attorney with the firm of Montgomery, Purdue, Blankinship & Austin, PLLC, represented Dr. Barry.
 - Mary Waggoner, Director of Communications for the Issaquah School District was interviewed at the district's administrative offices on June 15, 1999, and again on May 11, 2000. Chris Hirst, an attorney with the firm of Montgomery, Purdue, Blankinship & Austin, PLLC, represented Ms. Waggoner.
 - Denise Passinetti, former VP of Public Relations for KNCB/Dave, was interviewed at the Attorney General's Office in Seattle on May 11, 2000. Ms. Passinetti was not represented by counsel at the interview.
- 2.3 Documents submitted by the complainant, Bill Elder, were reviewed.

III.

RELEVANT AREAS OF LAW

3.1 RCW 42.17.130 states the following:

**“Forbids use of public office or agency facilities in campaigns. No elective official nor any employee of his office nor any person appointed to or employed by any public office or agency may use or authorize the use of any of the facilities of a public office or agency, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of assisting a campaign for election of any person to any office or for the promotion of or opposition to any ballot proposition. Facilities of public office or agency include, but are not limited to, use of stationery, postage, machines, and equipment, use of employees of the office or agency during working hours, vehicles, office space, publications of the office or agency, and clientele lists of persons served by the office or agency: PROVIDED, That the foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to the following activities:
(3) Activities which are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency.”**

3.2 WAC 390-05-271 states the general applications of RCW 42.17.130 as follows:

**“(1) RCW 42.17.130 does not restrict the right of any individual to express his or her own personal views concerning, supporting, or opposing any candidate or ballot proposition, if such expression does not involve a use of facilities of a public office or agency.
(2) RCW 42.17.130 does not prevent a public office or agency from (a) making facilities available on a nondiscriminatory, equal access basis for political uses or (b) making an objective and fair presentation of facts relevant to a ballot proposition, if such action is part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency.”**

3.3 WAC 390-05-273 states the following:

“Normal and regular conduct of a public office or agency, as that term is used in the proviso to RCW 42.17.130, means conduct which is (1) lawful, i.e., specifically authorized, either expressly or by necessary implication, in an appropriate enactment, and (2) usual, i.e., not effected or authorized in or by some extraordinary means or manner. No local office or agency may authorize a use of public facilities for the purpose of assisting a candidate's campaign or promoting or opposing a ballot proposition, in the absence of a constitutional, charter, or statutory provision separately authorizing such use.”

IV.

FINDINGS

- 4.1** A Feasibility Committee formed as early as 1994 in the Issaquah School District to begin discussing the issue of year-round schools as one of the crucial issues facing the district. On May 24, 1995, a citizens group made a presentation to the Issaquah School District Board of Directors that included demographic information about increasing student populations in the district. The Feasibility Committee stated that even with recent construction projects, student population would exceed total district capacity within five years. **See Exhibit #1.**
- 4.2** The Issaquah School District Board of Directors created the Alternate Futures Committee in 1997 to assist the board in planning for alternate housing for the short and long term projected growth in student population. In addition, on November 5, 1997, the Issaquah School District held an “Informational Community Meeting” at Clark Elementary School regarding “Multi-track Year Round Schools”. **See Exhibit #2.**

The Alternative Futures Committee was directed to review any and all options for housing students beyond the Capital Facilities Plan, and to also consider information addressed by the 1995 Feasibility Committee. In their response, the Issaquah School District stated the following:

“The District is growing fast enough to more than fill one additional elementary school per year. With 1,800 students already housed in portables, the Board of Directors realized we could not continue beyond the start of school year 2001-2002 without either new schools in place or an alternative, reformatted method of delivering education in the space available.”

- 4.3 The Alternate Futures Committee, as part of their review and information gathering process, discussed a number of options for housing students that included the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| - Multi-track Year-round | - Double Shifting |
| - Maximizing use of portables | - Busing |
| - Shifting Boundaries | - Utilizing space in the district |
| - Extended day | - Other grade span reconfigures |
| - Expansion/creation of magnets | - Reconfiguration of grade spans |
| - Combination of options | - Leasing space |
| - Vouchers | |

- 4.4 The Alternate Futures Committee reviewed information regarding each alternative, and made presentations to the Issaquah School board at their regularly scheduled board meetings between August-December, 1998. The information was shared with other interest groups or stakeholders, and the Alternative Futures Committee made a presentation and distributed an informational packet to the Issaquah School District Board of Directors on October 28, 1998. **See Exhibit #3.**

- 4.5 The Issaquah School District Board of Directors voted unanimously at their December 1998, regularly scheduled school board meeting to place a \$68.7 million construction bond and an \$7.9 million technology levy on the April 27, 1999 ballot.

Polls and surveys conducted by Issaquah School District:

- 4.6 The Issaquah School District has conducted a number of polls and surveys over the years regarding a variety of issues affecting the school district. In their response to the complaint regarding polls and surveys, the Issaquah School District stated:

“Surveys and polls are not new in the District, nor used merely in connection with election issues. Over the past eight years, the District has surveyed or polled our constituents numerous times on a range of issues, many of which have not been election-related. Each time we used outside professionals to take the pulse of the community. First, we did a Market Trends phone/focus group survey in 1991. In 1995 Market Trends did another similar survey.”

- 4.7 Mary Waggoner stated the following with regard to the polls and surveys conducted by the district:

“Information that comes from surveys is not just used in communications. It’s used in how the district operates. For example, people told us you don’t manage things very well there are mistakes that were made with Skyline High School as far as construction goes. The board then put together a Construction Guidelines Committee.”....

“The survey was used to tell what people think about how we do business and how can we be more responsive and better with public funds and their kids.” (Mary Waggoner Interview Under Oath, page 15)

Voice Poll (formerly Results Based Systems Corporation):

- 4.8 In August of 1997, the Issaquah School District contracted with Results Based Systems Corporation (currently known as “Voice Poll”). Results Based Systems Corporation is a communications organization that operated out of Everett, Washington. Mary Waggoner, Director of Communications for the Issaquah School District stated the following with regard to Voice Poll:

“...they do telephone surveys they’re marvelous, they’re quick, they’re efficient. People dial in a 1-800 number, respond to the questions in a recording and within twenty-four hours we get the information back.”

“This is a contract we’ve had for the past there years with this Voice Poll Corporation. There is some feeling among folks that when you self select and dial in a 1-800 number it’s not a random survey and therefore the information is invalid.”

“I wanted to run this to see just how valid Voice Poll is in relationship to a more expensive random sample. We found that the information we got here was very similar to the information we got there. There wasn’t any reason to invalidate that. So that helped me then know that I could use Voice Poll for a lot of different things and be fairly confident that the information is going to be accurate.” (Mary Waggoner, Interview Under Oath, pages 11-12)

4.9 On August 4, 1997, the Issaquah School District received an invoice from Results Based Systems Corporation for \$12,230. A description of the total amount included a one-time account set-up fee, a network membership fee, 2-Incall account fees plus long distance & \$.23 per completed calls, and an extended support services contract.

4.10 On August 29, 1997, the Issaquah School District made a payment to Results Based Systems Corporation totaling \$12,230. Between August, 1997-March 15, 2000, the Issaquah School District made payments totaling \$37,173.23 to Voice Poll/Results Based Systems Corporation. The \$37,173.23 included the \$12,230 initial payment, and the remaining payments were made as follows:

September 19, 1997	\$44.22		October 27, 1997	\$900.71
April 15, 1998	\$20.03		April 30, 1998	\$254.41
June 30, 1998	\$195.13		August 14, 1998	\$ 52.92
September 15, 1998	\$9,995.00		January 1, 1999	\$88.27
February 26, 1999	\$332.73		May 14, 1999	\$1,894.58
August 31, 1999	\$10,000.00		December 15, 1999	\$229.33
January 14, 2000	\$524.65		March 15, 2000	\$411.25

4.11 When asked if the Issaquah School District began using Voice Poll for bond and levy campaigns or were they used for other purposes, Mary Waggoner stated:

“I’ve used them in other districts and we’ve used them a dozen or more times since for a variety of things. Just turned in one that Issaquah Valley Elementary did of their parents to find out when parent teacher conferences should be. Two weeks before that Margaret did one on what the opinion of parents were in the gifted program, so we use them regularly.” (Mary Waggoner Interview Under Oath, page 12)

4.12 After the February 3, 1998, ballot measures in which voters of the Issaquah School District approved a \$61.7 million four-year maintenance and operations levy, and rejected a \$53.3 million school bond measure, a \$9.5 million technology levy, and a \$1 million transportation levy, the district and Voice Poll conducted a telephone survey. On March 27, 1998, the Issaquah School District sent out a “News Release” entitled “School district runs survey. **See Exhibit #4.** The third paragraph of the “News Release” stated the following:

“Next Thursday our Board will be discussing issues and timing of items that might appear on a school ballot,” said Superintendent Janet Barry. **“We’ll use the results of this open invitation survey together with results of a random sample survey in those discussions.”**

The sixth paragraph stated, **“The two-pronged survey, according to Barry, will help the district validate its information-gathering process and may give new information that will help the Board make decisions.”**

A script of the telephone survey was provided by the Issaquah School District. **See Exhibit #5.** The script stated the following down the left margin of the first page:

“An invitation to give advice. Take an anonymous telephone survey. The lines will be open AFTER...Mon. March 30 at 7 in the morning. Dial 1-800-311-3228 for poll #8130.”

“This month, Issaquah School District has held 8 Community Conversations to gather advice about issues that were on the ballot Feb.3. Not everyone was able to attend, but we still want everyone’s advice.”

4.13 The telephone survey conducted by the Issaquah School District and Voice Poll included a total of twenty-nine (29) survey questions, and according to the introduction on the first page took about 6 minutes to complete. The survey questions were grouped as follows:

- ◆ Asking if respondent lived in the district and which high school they lived closest to;
- ◆ grading the performance of the Issaquah School District (A-F);
- ◆ ranking on a scale of 1-6, do respondents agree/disagree about issues such as overcrowding of Issaquah schools, quality

schools = quality community, good schools increase resale value of homes, and are current computers adequate;

- ◆ the issue of purchasing land for future schools, or only purchasing land for schools when needed;
- ◆ ranking on a scale of 1-6, do respondents favor/not favor the \$53 million school construction plan, and asking respondent to express their concerns about the plan;
- ◆ ranking on a scale of 1-6, do respondents think that its “very important” or “not very important” issues about overcrowded elementary schools, building new schools will relieve overcrowding, building less expensive now than in the future, building elementary/middle schools will not require the building of a new high school;
- ◆ ranking on a scale of 1-6, the level of concern over having 1,800 students taking classes in portables, how much concern would the respondent have if there was a tax increase of \$88 a year over current levels, and are the issue of impact fees on newly constructed homes;
- ◆ ranking on a scale of 1-6, do respondents favor/not favor computer and technology funding for a \$4.75 million technology levy, and whether respondents have any concerns about the technology levy;
- ◆ ranking on a scale of 1-6, how important respondents feel about training teachers to use technology in the classroom, the use of computers in the classroom being essential, computers and technology will be equally shared by all students and schools, continuing technology funding approved four years ago;
- ◆ ranking on a scale of 1-6, do respondents favor purchasing ten new buses and funding those buses from a \$1 million tax levy, and what concerns, if any, about the transportation levy;
- ◆ demographic and statistical questions such as age, if they had any children/grandchildren attending Issaquah SD, and sources of information about the Issaquah SD.

Eiland Research:

- 4.14 Eiland Research is a public opinion and market research firm that conducted a survey for the Issaquah School District in late March-early April of 1998. The survey conducted by Eiland Research was paid for and provided to the Issaquah School district by Seattle-Northwest Securities Corporation.

- 4.15 Seattle-Northwest Securities Corporation is a bond-underwriting firm, and the survey was provided in accordance with a Managing Underwriter's Agreement entered into by both parties. Contained in part 2.B. of the Managing Underwriter's Agreement was the following provision:

“Provide for a public opinion survey to assist public participation in the capital improvement planning process”.

On May 11, 1998, Seattle-Northwest Securities Corporation made a check payable to Eiland Research in the amount of \$5,750, for an April 9, 1998 invoice (invoice inadvertently states 1996). **See Exhibit #6.**

- 4.16 The invoice stated that an “Issaquah School District Community Survey, (N=250)” was to be conducted by Eiland Research. The survey consisted of 27 questions of a 250-person randomly generated sample. **See Exhibit #7.** The Issaquah School District survey had been submitted by Mr. Eiland to PDC staff for review. The survey questions were grouped as follows:

- ◆ grading the performance of the Issaquah School District (A-F);
- ◆ agree/disagree/not sure, about issues such as overcrowding, quality schools = quality community, good schools increase resale value of homes;
- ◆ the issue of purchasing land for future schools, or only purchasing land for schools when needed;
- ◆ ranking on a scale of “very important” to “not very important” to “don’t know”, issues about building new schools to relieve overcrowding, elementary school overcrowding, building less expensive now than in the future, building elementary/middle schools will not require the building of a new high school;
- ◆ level of concern over having 1,800 students taking classes in portables and the issue of how much concern would the respondent have if there was a tax increase of \$88 a year over current levels;
- ◆ issue of impact fees on newly constructed homes, and if those fees were “too high, about right, too low, or not sure”;
- ◆ computer and technology funding for a \$4.75 million technology levy, and whether respondents would “very strongly favor, strongly favor, somewhat favor, not favor, or don’t know” the proposal, and concerns, if any, about the technology levy;
- ◆ information about computer technology and the training of teachers, use of computers in the classroom being essential, computers/technology will be equally shared, tech program

continues funding approved four years ago, and ranking those issues on a scale of “very important” to “not very important” to “don’t know”;

- ◆ purchase ten new buses, funding those buses from a \$1 million tax levy, and whether respondents would “very strongly favor to, not favor, or don’t know”, and what concerns, if any, they had about the transportation levy;
- ◆ demographic and statistical questions such as age, children/grandchildren attending Issaquah SD, sources of information about the Issaquah SD, and M/F.

Eiland Research and Voice-Poll Comparisons:

- 4.17 In addition to the survey information from Eiland Research and Voice Poll, a comparison of the two surveys was also completed for the Issaquah School District. **See Exhibit #8.** The Eiland Research and Voice Poll Survey Comparisons began by stating the following:

“Although both surveys contained similar and, in some cases, identical questions, the format and the sample are different. As you can see by the respondent’s breakdown, we had more parents/grandparents for the Voice Poll (85%) then were in Eiland’s random sample (44%). Knowing that helped explain some of the differences in opinions.”

“Because of rounding, not all totals equal 100%. Eiland’s survey involved 250 community residents randomly selected from telephone prefixes. The Voice Poll survey involved 117 callers who were motivated by notification through the schools or the media.”

- 4.18 The comparison listed the questions, and compared the responses to each of the questions. The responses were broken down by percentages for both Voice Poll and Eiland Research, and included in the right hand margins of the pages some statements about the comparison. Some of those comparison statements included the following:

1. District sources are naturally a better source for parents—therefore they figure larger in the Voice Poll group.
2. Across the board, people see a connection between quality of life and schools, sound property values and schools.

3. The Eiland Research sample shows a huge chunk of people who do not know about educational technology status in the schools.
4. Knowing the schools are overcrowded is important to people. There are many who are not associated with schools who do not know about overcrowding.
5. Even among those who have no children in school, there is concern about portables.
6. Money is an issue for the majority of people. This question was based upon previous bond issue and does not take into consideration any discussions about reduction or changes to property taxes.
7. People associated with schools know about impact fees; there's a big chunk of others who do not have opinions.

Evans McDonough Company Incorporated:

- 4.19 The polling firm of Evans McDonough was hired to conduct a survey for the Issaquah School District during the period of November 21-23, 1998. In a memorandum dated November 9, 1998, Don McDonough representing Evans/McDonough included the following to Janet Barry of the Issaquah School District with regard to their project goal:

“The stated goal of the work was “to research public attitudes about the school district; to develop and maintain certain measures of community satisfaction, and to assess community response to the future educational needs in facilities and programs.”

- 4.20 The survey conducted by Evans/McDonough consisted of 400-15 minute telephone interviews of randomly selected registered voters in the Issaquah School District. The survey cost \$13,800, and included up to 100 questions for each respondent with a margin of error rate of +- 4.9 percentage points at the 95% confidence interval. **See Exhibit #9.**

- 4.21 About 20% of the survey questions were general demographic information. The additional questions are grouped according to the issue as follows:

- ◆ community issues and growth;
- ◆ favorable/unfavorable ratings school board members, city council and other local officials, and three newspaper companies;

- ◆ rating the Issaquah School District on a scale of excellent to poor regarding job performance on a variety of issues;
- ◆ grading the district on a number of issues (letter grade A-F);
- ◆ best thing/biggest criticism about the Issaquah School District and how the current share of tax dollars is being spent;
- ◆ asking registered voters on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree about a variety of issues affecting the Issaquah School District;
- ◆ funding issues, taxes and building schools;
- ◆ the issue of reformatting the Issaquah School District;
- ◆ issues of building schools, buying land, computers and technology over a scale of “not important to meet needs” to “very important to meet needs”;
- ◆ overcrowding issues of student population, portables and growth on a scale from “very concerned” to “not at all concerned”
- ◆ asking party affiliation (R/D/I) of respondent;
- ◆ property taxes increasing over the last two years;
- ◆ asking about absentee voter, precinct information, registration date for voters, and whether they voted in elections going back to the 1996 primary election.

4.22 The Issaquah School District stated the following with regard to the survey conducted by Evans/McDonough in their response:

“In Fall 1998, the Board commissioned a customer satisfaction survey through an independent firm, EMC. The survey showed community perception of District accomplishments, management of resources, and growth patterns. We conducted it to clarify citizen input from the Community Conversations and surveys of last spring and to measure our progress on program changes made at the suggestion of those Conversations and then communicate about such changes—for example, Construction Standards Guidelines and the development of a community-based architectural selection process.”

4.23 The Issaquah School District stated the following in their response with regard to the polls and surveys they conducted:

“The enclosed materials clearly demonstrate our use of polls as communications tools to help us adjust programs and meet community expectations. We use polls and surveys like any other well-managed business does—to measure community satisfaction with our performance, to tailor programs to the desires of the community and to better understand how the district is evolving—both demographically and in its preferences for educational service. We use these tools and the results to help plan for change.”

The Issaquah School District provided a number of documents to the PDC as part of this investigation. Those documents included 3-pages of information about survey information, and a document from Eiland Research entitled “Summary of phone conversation 4/1. **See Exhibit #10.**

The summary from Eiland Research included information about survey results, how the survey information compares to information from Community Conversations, and what might be concluded from this. The 3-pages of information about surveys began by stating the following:

“Survey results tell us 3 main things:

- 1. People equate...A. good schools w/good community and B. strong property values.**
- 2. That overcrowded schools and portables are a concern for a majority of people.**
- 3. Money is an issue for everyone.”**

The last page of the information stated the following:

“Additionally...We learned from Community Conversations that there was not enough passion in our message. Survey results show large percentages of people have “no opinion” about school issues.

So...we will launch an aggressive information program that:

- 1. Shows overcrowding across the district.**
- 2. Establishes community standards for construction.**
- 3. Shows our commitment to maintaining quality schools for our community.”**

CONSULTANTS:

KNCB/Dave:

- 4.24 The Issaquah School District put out a Request for Proposal to provide consulting work for the district. On October 12, 1998, Denise Passinetti, Vice-President of Public Relations for KNCB/Dave submitted a cover letter along with additional information to Mary Waggoner, Communications Director of the Issaquah School District regarding their Request for Proposal. The professional qualifications that was included by KNCB/Dave along with the cover letter stated the following:

“KNCB/Dave has distinguished itself in the Pacific Northwest marketplace by our creative approach to advertising and our strength in parlaying public relations and strategic marketing concepts into successful communications campaigns to achieve our clients’ goals.” “KNCB/Dave is a full-service agency with professional expertise in every aspect of communication.”

- 4.25 Denise Passinetti was a former district employee of the Issaquah School District, having served as the Communications Director from about 1993 to 1996. Ms. Passinetti had been instrumental in crafting the five-year work and strategic communications plan the district had been utilizing. On November 2, 1998, KNCB/Dave made a presentation to the Issaquah School District with regard to the development of a new Strategic District Communications Plan.
- 4.26 On December 1, 1998, a memorandum was sent from Denise Passinetti, Vice-President of Public Relations to Janet Barry, thanking the district for selecting KNCB/Dave to assist in creating the long-term communications plan, and outlining the scope of work necessary along with a budget. **See Exhibit #11.** The budget submitted by KNCB/Dave was for a total of \$22,000, and was for time only and did not include any of the hard costs associated with the activities such as printing, mailings, advertising, etc.

The strategic district communications plan, which included the budget and scope of work, are broken down as follows:

Research: The research portion included \$500 to assist with surveys, meetings & review of current materials, and \$2,500 to conduct up to 15 key leader interviews and then report on the information gathered. The memo from Denise Passinetti stated the following with regard to the research:

“I will be working with the research team on the telephone survey component as well as reviewing past research information to begin developing elements of the communications plan. After the telephone survey is completed, key leader interviews will be conducted to gather more in-depth information, test messages and to learn how closely aligned these citizens’ opinions are to those citizens’ opinions in the telephone survey. A summary report and analysis of the information we received will be given to the District.”

Communication Plan: The communication portion included \$4,000 to develop a three-year Strategic District Communication Plan. The memo from Denise Passinetti stated the following with regard to the communication plan:

“This plan will lay the frame work for the District’s communication efforts for the next three years including the target audiences, themes, messages, specific approaches, timelines, research mechanisms and budgets. This plan will be comprehensive and developed in cooperation with the District’s Communication Director and you with a formal presentation to the school board in January or early February.”

Implementation of strategic communications plan: The total costs to implement the Strategic District Communication Plan was \$15,000, that included six months of implementation support @ \$2,500 per month. The memo stated the following regarding the implementation:

“Upon approval of the plan, we will meet with the Communication Director and you to determine which elements of the plan we will be responsible for implementing over the following 6 months.”

- 4.27 On November 29, 1998, Denise Passinetti submitted the Strategic Plan for 1999-2000 with the changes that were made from the Work Plan. **See Exhibit #12, Strategic Plan with handwritten notes.** Some of the elements of the strategic plan included identifying any emerging issues not addressed in original objectives, strategies and tactics necessary to meet both short and long term objectives, evaluation of current communication methods to meet these objectives, creation of a budget to implement, and identifying benchmarks.

- 4.28 A Purchase Order Requisition from the Issaquah School District was completed on December 14, 1998, in the amount of \$22,000 to KNCB/Dave for Strategic Communications Consultant. On January 1, 1999, an additional memorandum was sent from Denise Passinetti to Janet Barry regarding a revised scope of work for Strategic District Communications Plan. **See Exhibit #13.** That memorandum included the following:

“Due to the fact the Board has approved placing a capital bond and technology levy on the April ballot, I believe some revisions to the original Scope of Work are appropriate. I have discussed the changes with Mary and she agrees it will be difficult to devote the necessary time to the long-term plan anytime before May. In addition to the normal communications efforts by the district, the public will want a great deal of information on the capital bond and technology levy prior to the election. Because the public information required during this period must be a priority for the district, I am suggesting the following changes.”

- 4.29 One of the changes included conducting the Key Leader Interviews in May after the April 27, 1999, election to ensure the comments were useful to the overall plan and not just focused on the ballot issues. The other change was the development of an interim or short-term communication plan to cover the months prior to the ballot issues, as well as the long-term communications plan. The needs were so unique for dealing with the multi-tracking issue that the interim or short-term plan and the original long-term plan could not be combined. The cost of developing the short-term plan was included as part of the original budget for creating the long-term plan.

- 4.30 Mary Waggoner stated the following when asked if the revised scope of work for the communications plan was changed to focus on construction bond and technology levy information:

“The district was doing the regular business and operation of a school district at the same time we were being charged by our public to communicate about an election issue that happened to be in the future. Denise was consulting and helping with that regular routine stuff at the same time that she was working through the analysis of this and helping us operate better and communicate...We knew that we needed to be very clear on where the district was gonna go after April. Were we going to be building new schools? Or were we going to be multi-tracking? Because the communication pieces were

going to be very different. If we were building new schools then we would be talking about boundary changes, construction schedules, and normal reform efforts of education. If we were going to be multi-tracking then the communication efforts were going to be which track your child was in and what that was going to mean. So any communications plan that we did at this point was going to change in April. So we worked on long-range operational strategies here and after April then we were going to work on other aspects of the district whether it was multi-tracking or whether it was building.” (Mary Waggoner Interview Under Oath, page 19)

- 4.31 When asked if KNCB/Dave had been hired by the Issaquah School District to pass the construction bond and technology levy, Ms. Passinetti stated that they had not and that the “lion share of the work” on the communications plan had been conducted after the levy had been approved.

KNCB/Dave consulting for the Volunteers for Issaquah Schools:

- 4.32 The Volunteers for Issaquah Schools (VIS) was the political committee formed to support the April 27, 1999, construction bond and technology levy. VIS also employed the services of KNCB/Dave and Denise Passinetti to assist with the campaign. The Volunteers for Issaquah Schools made three payments to KNCB/Dave for “Professional Services” as disclosed on their PDC reports. **See Exhibit #14.** Those payments were reported by VIS as follows:

• February 12, 1999	\$1,750.00
• March 29, 1999	\$1,750.00
• April 29, 1999	<u>\$3,552.11</u>
Total payments	\$7,052.11

In addition, the polling firm of Evans McDonough was hired to conduct a survey for the Volunteers for Issaquah Schools. A payment of \$1,507.98 was made to Evans McDonough on February 12, 1999, with the purpose or description listed as surveys and polls.

- 4.33 Denise Passinetti stated that the Issaquah School District did not refer or pressure either KNCB/Dave or her into working for the Volunteers for Issaquah Schools Committee. Ms. Passinetti stated the following about how KNCB/Dave was selected and the services provided to the Volunteers for Issaquah Schools Committee:

“Leslie (Leslie Austin was the chair of VIS) is somebody, she’s a parent but she’s very involved and somebody who I called upon a lot when I was working at Issaquah...”

“And Leslie called, we’re doing a third campaign, and she said “I don’t know what to do differently and we always do this.” And I said “you have to step it up and you have to make it a campaign and you have to hire somebody.” Not meaning me but I said, “you need to hire somebody that can help you do phone banks and can help you deal with doorbelling, you really have to step it up”....And so they came back a week later and asked if I’d do it she said, “I just really trust you” and like I said we’ve worked together and everything so I said fine.”

“We sat down and just did a plan. This is what we’re doing, here’s how many votes you need and we looked at all the precincts and what the percentage of yes votes and no. We went down it until we got to the number and said here’s where we focus and here’s where we phone...it was the most simplistic...And we said we’re gonna phone bank and we’re gonna call everybody twice and we’re gonna go out and have two weekends of doorbelling and we’re going down as far as we can. And we did the mailings and helped put those together.” (Denise Passinetti Interview Under Oath, pages 26-28)

- 4.34 Ms. Passinetti stated that at no time during meetings she had with Issaquah School District officials and employees that were conducted on school district time, did the discussions address activities related to levy committee business. In addition, she stated that Issaquah School District employees, including Dr. Barry and Mary Waggoner attended levy committee meetings and participated in levy committee activities on their own time.
- 4.35 Mary Waggoner stated the following when asked about if there were any discussions along the lines of the levy committee is going to do this mailing and this ad so the school district can target their resources elsewhere:

“No everything we did is public information so anybody could find out when we were doing things. Anybody could go to a VIS meeting and find out what they were doing. So there was no attempt to hide anything. It was so nice to have Denise with VIS because I didn’t get calls from people saying tell me about this or help me write this, I could just say I can’t talk about that, call Denise. It was, it was marvelous because I didn’t tick anybody off to say you have to call me after five o’clock and besides you got to make a long distance call cause I live in Snohomish and I can’t use the school phone to talk about this...” (Mary Waggoner Interview Under Oath, page 21)

4.36 In their response, the Issaquah School District stated:

“It has been our experience that the VIS decision to hire Ms. Passinetti has greatly reduced the number of contacts and the potential for questionable interaction between VIS enthusiasts and our Director of Communications and other District personnel.”

Publications:

4.37 The Issaquah School District stated the following in their response submitted to the PDC:

“We took the first step in communicating the concept “The District at a Crossroads” at the District’s annual opening day assembly in September 1998. Superintendent Barry illustrated our dilemma and unveiled a banner “Our Community Must Decide-Build or Reformat.” This was the first response to staff and community requests for clear and increased communication about the choices we were facing.”
Throughout the fall, Superintendent Barry, District administrators and Board members spoke to the community about the District’s being at a Crossroads and the choices that might be put before the community if the Board set another election.”

February, 1999 edition of Focus:

- 4.38** The Issaquah School District publishes a newsletter quarterly called the Focus. Some of the previous editions of the Focus Newsletter have contained bond and levy information about upcoming ballot propositions. The February 1999 edition of the Focus Newsletter contained the headline “Election set for April, Voters to decide: “Build or Multi-track”. **See Exhibit #15.**
- 4.39 The February 1999 edition of the Focus Newsletter- was the primary publication used by the Issaquah School District to communicate information about the April, 1999 ballot measures. A total of 32,000 copies of the February 1999 Focus Newsletter were printed according to a February 19, 1999, invoice from Bear Printing. This compares to the printing of 34,000 copies of the Focus Newsletter-Fall 1999, edition (29,000 original copies, 5,000 reprinted copies) and the 30,00 copies printed for the June, 1999 newsletter.
- 4.40 Of the 32,000 printed, 29,213 copies were mail prepared and delivered to the Post office for mailing. The total cost of printing and labeling was \$6,429.12. The Focus is mailed to registered voters in the Issaquah School District, and the total postage costs for the February, 1999, edition was \$2,697.14 at a per piece postage cost of \$.0923. By comparison, the fall, 1998 edition of the Focus Newsletter was mailed to 28,680 registered voters and the June 1999 edition of the Focus Newsletter was mailed to 29,220 registered voters.
- 4.41 The Issaquah School District had mailed editions of the Focus and other district publications to registered voters for a number of years. When asked about the issue of mailing and communicating with only registered voters and why not all postal patrons, Mary Waggoner stated:
- “Because it doubles the cost for us and for the last eight years that’s what we’ve been doing.” “Understanding PDC regulations, that was one of the first questions that I’d asked when I came here and it is a long standing tradition for the district to have it done that way every year be it election or not election, year. And it does save us considerable amount of money in that publication postage cost.”** (Mary Waggoner Interview Under Oath, page 8)

- 4.42 When asked how the targeting of mailings and communications with only registered voters began and when, Denise Passinetti, Communications Director for the Issaquah School District from about 1993-1996, Ms. Passinetti stated:

“No I did it. I implemented it. We were spending a ton of money and it was going to, it was the generic postal. And you know one of the things is that it’s pretty ineffective when you get something like that in the mailbox and people toss it.”
“...we just crossed our list, we did tax payers, I mean at the time I was there we did tax payers and parents, merged the list and that became our list and that’s what we used for all district mailings. And then we did the putting copies in public places so we always over printed...a couple thousand and then could go to libraries, and the Chamber, and the visitor center and just kind of where ever they had free publications. And we did it that way and I have to tell you it cut costs...” (Denise Passinetti Interview Under Oath, page 31)

- 4.43 Finally, Dr. Janet Barry stated:

“...And my recollection is that we always talked about our responsibility for PDC. We were mailing to registered voters, we had always mailed to registered voters so I don’t think we saw any compelling reason to do otherwise.” (Dr. Janet Barry Interview Under Oath, page 11)

- 4.44 The information on the first page of the February, 1999 edition of the FOCUS included down the left hand margin of the first page and continuing on the right hand margin of the third page **“Multi-Track: What would it mean?”**. The information describes a multi-track system that rotates groups of students (3,4 or 5 groups) on different schedules over 12 months of the year on a rotation cycle. The information goes on to state, “Here are a few basic facts about the multi-track option” and includes the following bulleted items:

- **“Multi track is untested in a high-achieving district like Issaquah.”**
- **“No other district in the state has a multi-track schedule.”**

- **“No district chooses multi-track as a way to improve learning.”**
- **“Current focus on learning will be threatened by urgency of scheduling.”**
- **“Teachers focus on instruction will be threatened by need to pack and unpack classroom supplies overnight.”**
- **“Issaquah will be a school district island, surrounded by quality districts with quality schedules—during a national and state teacher shortage.”**
- **“People value the quality of education in Issaquah schools and equate it to the quality of life and to their property values.”**

4.45 The remainder of the first page contained bond and levy information under the heading **“Election set for April, Voters to decide: “Build or Multi-track”**. That information included the statement “The board and administration feel that while multi-tracking is possible to institute, it will be detrimental to education in Issaquah” and then lists a number of important goals. Some of the goals that were bulleted included avoiding the costs of a new high school and saving more than \$70 million, more student seats than any plan studied, doesn’t overbuild permanent school space and makes strategic use of economical portables, and preserves the concept of neighborhood schools economically.

4.46 The next section was **“About location”** and discussed possible site locations for elementary schools. Finally, the **“About cost”** section of the first page contained information about the total cost and that it will be \$4.97 per \$1,000 of assessed value in 2000, followed by the bolded statement **“That is the same tax rate as homeowners paid in 1998. The proposed bond and companion technology mean no increase over 1998 tax rates for property owners.”** This statement was followed by two bulleted items that included:

- “In addition to subtracting anticipated impact fees, the board resolution includes a pledge to reduce bond sales on this issue dollar-for-dollar for all impact fee money over \$5 million that might be collected the next five years. That could translate into an additional tax savings for the public.”

4.47 Page 2 of the Focus included a section entitled “How we responded to your requests” and the following bulleted items with bolded phrases, along with other information:

- “Residents **do like how and what we teach** and the “product’ we produce.”
- “Parents **treasure our staff.**”
- “Residents **appreciate public meetings** and listening sessions.”
- “**Kept taxes within two cents per thousand** of 1998 rates.”
- “**Established cost-effective construction standards** for now and into the future.
- “**Linked arms with residents** to solve a problem and secure the highest impact fees in the state.”

4.48 Also included on the second page was the section “Four points to remember about the April election” which included a number of bolded and underlined statements as follows:

2. **“The need is clear and strong.** District-wide, we have added **1,500 new students in two years.** Now we have **1,800 students in portables.** Projections show that, whether we add classrooms or not, we will have another **3,000 to 3,500 students in the next five years.**”

3. **“This levy represents a clear choice: do we build or go to multi-track?** If the bond fails, the district will begin the process of multi-tracking in our schools. This decision is the result of a months-long effort, including **community input and involvement.**”

4. “Survey results show that **confidence in the district is high.** More than half of the respondents feel that Issaquah’s **teachers, Superintendent, and school board are doing a “good” or “excellent” job.** Results also point out that residents feel **Issaquah’s schools are a safe place** for their kids. Finally, over 90 percent of those polled believe that **teaching computer skills is an important part of education today.**”

4.49 The bottom of page 2 states “The public process: how the board made their decision”, and goes on to detail the process which ultimately led to the April ballot measure.

4.50 On page 3 of the Focus, under a caricature of a student reading was the title **“New leadership, new standards, new designs = a new story for April levy”**. It included bulleted information about enrolling 1,500 more students in the last two years, that 3,000-3,500 more students coming into the district in the next five years, and concluded with a statement that the majority of people (56%) approved of building schools last May.

4.51 Under the heading **“A community plan”**, the information discussed the number of groups involved in revising this plan and included bulleted information about new architects being used that have an economy-based vision, and that the district collects the highest impact fees of any district in the state. In addition, it also stated:

“In-depth exploration of ways to add classrooms without construction. The conclusion is that while multi-tracking is possible, it would be detrimental to the educational system in the district.”

4.52 Under the heading **“A clear choice”**, the information included the statement, “This election represents a clear choice between building classroom space or undertaking a multi-track schedule. This election is about preserving the quality of education in our schools **at the same rate paid by homeowners in 1998.**”

4.53 The fourth page of the Focus included information about Technology and the Technology levy being on the April ballot and what it will fund. It went on to state “Technology is important because...”

- **“Information is not limited to what can be learned or stored in school”;**
- **“Students are encouraged to dig deeper to explore topics in a variety of ways”;**
- **“Students are inspired to explore areas of interest and allowed to discover for themselves”;**
- **“It reinforces connections to the real world”;**
- **“It enriches and extends the curriculum”.**

4.54 The “Tech Q & A” section contained some of the following statements:

- **“According to the Washington State Technology Alliance, high-tech companies prefer to hire their skilled workers locally. That future skilled citizenry could be grown right here in Issaquah schools”**

- “Technology sparks interest. Students become less passive and dependent to “give” them information. Instead they become active under the guidance of a teacher who shows them ways to “discover” information and how to use it for deeper learning and understanding.”
- The information under the Did you know? Section contained a number of bolded words such as: **“college credit, become certified in A+ (programming) and CISCO (networking), CAD auto shop diagnosis technology, and industrial applications; physics, space research, and world politics; equal access; lab experiments; detail worldwide up-to-date maps.”**

4.55 The top portion of the next page included a letter from Issaquah School District Superintendent Dr. Janet Barry entitled “The Super Speaks Up”, while the bottom portion of the page contained information about the district having to replace 7 principals. “The Super Speaks Up” section contained some of the following:

- The communication begins with **“It’s up to voters now:** The question is clear, and so is the cost. Should we build to serve our children – or should we “multi-track” children into four or five shifts, “time sharing” the space we have.”
- “If we multi-track, what do we spend? Planning and start-up costs will be about \$8 million, after which we can break even by keeping schools enrolled at 120% of capacity.”
- “Multi-tracking’s greatest cost is in quality. Teachers and principals verify we’ll lose the ability to attract and keep top-quality teachers and principals. We’ll pay in lost teaching time, instructional teaming, communication, and family time. We’ll feel fragmentation of neighborhoods, community athletic programs, and lost community access to school facilities. The real costs are to families, community culture and educational quality. Voters will have to decide these dollar vs. quality issues.”
- “The proposal we strongly recommend calls for four schools, two expansions, and portables for 700 students. Here is why this package gained unanimous board support” and goes to list six items about the bond package or proposal.

- 4.56 The next page of the Focus included a “coming events” section, which listed events for the remainder of February and all of March. Finally, the last page was entitled “How to calculate your taxes” included a chart with a formula detailing how to calculate your local school tax. In addition, it also included a “Total local school tax...5-year perspective” chart.

Capital bond and Technology levy: The basics:

- 4.57 A publication entitled “Capital bond and Technology levy: The basics” was produced by the Issaquah School District. **See Exhibit #16.** The exact costs and the number of copies printed or mailed for this publication is unknown, since according to testimony, they were only printed as needed until the Focus newsletter was published. The pamphlet contained much of the same information that was included in the Focus Newsletter, February 1999 edition.
- 4.58 Page 1 of the pamphlet included the statement “The board and administration feel that while multi-tracking is possible to institute, it will be detrimental to education in Issaquah. The construction plan selected by the board avoids multi-tracking and meets a number of important goals.” The pamphlet then goes on to list a number of important goals.
- 4.59 The second page of the publication is entitled “The multi-track option: What would it mean?” It contained a brief description of how multi-tracking would operate and then states “Here are a few basic facts about the multi-track option “ and then goes on to include the same bulleted items about multi-tracking that were included on pages 1 and 3 of the Focus.
- 4.60 The third page of the publication entitled “Construction bond; An overview” contained the following bolded heading along with two sentences. **“The Decision.** School board members unanimously approved placing a capital bond on the ballot to add classroom space. They believe the alternative – a multi-track school schedule – will jeopardize the quality of education Issaquah students now receive.”
- 4.61 The eighth page of the publication included a section entitled “Four points to remember”, and also “How we responded to your requests.” This was the same information that was included in the Focus.

- 4.62 On page 9, entitled “New leadership, new standards, new designs = a new story for April levy included the statement “This election represents a clear choice between building classroom space or undertaking a multi-track schedule. This election is about preserving the quality of education in our schools **at the same rate paid by homeowners in 1998.**”
- 4.63 The final page contained a letter from Issaquah School District Superintendent Dr. Janet Barry entitled “The Super Speaks Up” similar to the one which appeared in Focus.

Multi-track 101:

- 4.64 A ten (10) page publication entitled “**Multi-track 101, How it might work in Issaquah**” was printed and distributed by the Issaquah School District. **See Exhibit #17.** The exact costs and the number of copies printed or mailed for this publication is unknown, since they were only printed as needed until the Focus newsletter was published. Mary Waggoner stated the following with regard to the Multi-track 101 publication:

“No, I don’t remember when we produced this. It would have come about as the result of the work of the Alternative Futures Committee that was established by the board to say, to explore what the options were. We knew we could either build new schools or do something else to handle the enrollment growth that we had. The board asked this particular committee to look at all the possibilities and come forth with the one that was most feasible. When they came forth with the one that was most feasible, then our community asked us to define it. Year round multi-tracking, what does that mean? What is it? So we developed this in response to public requests, that they had information about what it is.”
“They went to PTA groups that came in and requested them.”
“They were mailed in response to requests, but there was not a mailing like there was with Focus.” (Mary Waggoner Interview Under Oath, pages 5-6)

- 4.65 In her response to the PDC dated May 24, 2000, Dr. Janet Barry stated the following with regard to the Multi-track 101 and Capitol Bond and Levy: The Basics:

“Both of those documents were run as needed on the office copy machines. Neither was mailed en masse, but on an as-requested basis. For those reasons, there are no records available that specifically relate to the cost of The Basics or Multitrack 101. It is reasonable, however, to conclude that its numbers and distribution were a small fraction of the circulation of the District newsletter, FOCUS.”

4.66 Each page of the “Multi-track 101” publication included down the left margin of the page under the Issaquah School District logo, the phrase “Items to note:” and some of the following statements:

- MT scheduling will begin in 2001 if there is no classroom construction;
- High school students and K-8 students will be on different school calendars
- It may not be possible for K-8 siblings to have the same schedule;
- No district in the state of Washington is on MT;
- No district chooses MT because of improved education.

4.67 The second and third pages of this publication were entitled **“Multi-track, What we know; what we’ve learned”**, and included statements about saving capital fund dollars by not building more classrooms, and that district-wide Issaquah elementary schools are at 115% of capacity. In addition, cost savings are in direct proportion to how much schools are over-capacity, and without boundary changes and an even distribution of students, MT could cost more to operate than a traditional schedule.

4.68 They also included statements about air conditioning being a critical decision for the district, and that including it would add \$6.9 million to the first year planning and start up costs. In addition, most districts nation-wide have abandoned multi-tracking prior to recouping start up costs and that some operation cost savings would require negotiated agreement with unions.

4.69 The fourth page was entitled **“Multi-track, Some program impacts”**, and went on to list how some programs would be impacted by MT. Those items included the ability of students to choose classes, academics vs. interscholastic activities, coordinating school events and school groups, district or statewide testing, and the issue of reconfiguration.

4.70 The fifth page was entitled “**Multi-track, Some impacts on families and community**”, and went on to state “School families and the community will feel the change in many ways:” and went on to include the following information:

Track assignments

- Families must choose tracks.
- Not all tracks will coincide with a family’s first choices.
- Most districts try, but cannot completely satisfy, track requests, either within a school or for a family with students in both elementary and middle school.
- Students wanting to play a specific sport will have to select that track. The athletic and academic tracks may not always coincide.
- Although it is possible with a 5-track plan to have 17 days of common break time in summer, families with students in K-8 and in 9-12 will be dealing with at least two different school schedules.

Community use of schools

- There will be no schools available for traditional summer programs, such as Issaquah Park & Recreation.
- Students K-8 who have traditionally attended summer school classes for extra academic help will not have that option available.

4.71 The sixth page was entitled “**Multi-track, Some impacts on the classroom**” and went on to list how the following classroom issues would be impacted by MT such as employee recruitment and retention, question of quality, and “time- shared” classrooms.

4.72 A portion of the sixth and seventh pages was entitled “**Multi-track, A planning timeline**” and went on to describe the timelines for planning and implementation of multi-tracking in the Issaquah School District. The timeline for multi-track began with the period May-August 1999, in which guidelines for implementing the plan would be established by a district/community planning committee, and end with July 31, 2001, when the tracks would begin.

4.73 The ninth and tenth pages listed six examples of school districts from around the United States, and their experiences with some form of multi-track education.

4.74 Dr. Janet Barry stated the following about the information being distributed by the Issaquah School District, and whether it was being used as a kind of a scare tactic so voters would approve the ballot propositions:

“...It was absolutely not a scare tactic. The district through the vehicle of what we call the Alternative Futures, Alternate Futures Committee spent months investigating how we could best deliver service if our community made the decision not to pay for additional schools. And the very best solution was multi-tracking. In my mind as superintendent and in the minds of most it was not the equivalent of building schools but it was the very best service delivery method that we had. And once the district made that clear the community, this community which is information hungry, wanted to know how will it work? How will it work? And I couldn’t step a foot outside this door without meeting that question one more time, how would this work?”

“I can’t tell you how strong the information demand for this was from moms and dads and teachers and people whose lives would be affected by this decision. It was a huge information demand.”

“So I won’t say it was unique to parents, they were the strongest interest group, and there were many others who were interested with a slightly different slant. But this was the central topic of conversation in the Issaquah community. What is multi-tracking? How does it work? How would it affect me, my family, my vacation schedule, my property value and so forth.” (Dr. Janet Barry Interview Under Oath, pages 5-6)

The board very specifically addressed that with the community and said our growth is going to come within the next ten years so we are looking at multi-tracking for about a ten-year period. And they were very, very clear about that. There were a lot of individuals who were trying to decide is this just a little something that we have to go through and we could save millions of dollars if we did it? And we looked at ten years of growth that would keep us on this solution for about that length of time. There’s no question that if we went this way it was going to take two years to plan. There would be significant start up costs associated with it. We would divert our resources toward particular investments that would be necessary to make multi-tracking work such as storage units at every school and so forth. So we would spend x amount of dollars, several million, we weren’t going to back off of that investment and divert our resources to another plan all of a sudden, we were very sincere about this. (Dr. Janet Barry, Interview Under Oath, pages 5-6)

- 4.75 When asked whether or not too much information was being distributed by the district with regard to multi-tracking and had they reached the saturation point, Dr. Barry stated:

“...but the information demand from this community was almost overwhelming. I guess I can’t go off the record but I would say that I nearly died of the information demand that I had to meet as superintendent. Never felt that we had unscrambled this complicated message well enough and I’ll tell you particularly the trouble spot. A lot of people think that year-round schooling is a fabulous idea and that we ought to be doing it. They were unable to differentiate year-round schooling from multi-tracking. Probably the day that they went in to cast their ballot they were still saying, “wait a minute now not all the kids are in the building at the same time you mean not all my kids could be available for vacation at the same time? Well I didn’t know that. So this was an extraordinary communications challenge for us and we never felt that we had done well enough.” (Dr. Janet Barry, Interview Under Oath, page 8)

- 4.76 The Issaquah School District provided a number of examples of information they had distributed to employees regarding RCW 42.17.130. They also conducted training and in one example took disciplinary action for one school principal with regard to information that had been distributed about the levy.

- 4.77 In all matters related to this investigation, Dr. Janet Barry, Mary Waggoner, and the Issaquah School District have fully cooperated with the Commission and have been forthright in the information provided in their response.

Respectfully Submitted this 27th day of March, 2001

Kurt Young
Chief Political Finance Specialist

EXHIBIT LIST

- Exhibit 1** May 24, 1995, presentation by the Year Round Schools Committee to the Issaquah School District Board of Directors.
- Exhibit 2** November 5, 1997, an informational community meeting was held in which information was distributed about the Issaquah School District Multi-Track Year Round Schools.
- Exhibit 3** October 26, 1998, minutes from the Alternate Futures Committee meeting regarding finalizing interim report to the Issaquah School District Board of Directors.
- Exhibit 4** A “News Release” from the Issaquah School District dated March 27, 1998.
- Exhibit 5** The script used by the Issaquah School District for a feedback line conducted by Voice Poll on March 30, 1998.
- Exhibit 6** Managing Underwriter’s Agreement between Seattle-Northwest Securities Corporation and the Issaquah School District dated April 27, 1998.
- Exhibit 7** The questions for a survey conducted by Eiland Research for the Issaquah School District.
- Exhibit 8** Eiland Research and Voice Poll Survey Comparison prepared for the Issaquah School District.
- Exhibit 9** The questions and response percentages to a survey conducted by Evans/McDonough Company Incorporated for the Issaquah School District, November 21-23, 1998.
- Exhibit 10** Additional information provided by Issaquah School District about survey results, and a document from Eiland Research entitled “Summary of phone conversation 4/1”.
- Exhibit 11** A memorandum dated December 1, 1998, from Denise Passinetti, VP of Public Relations for KNCB/Dave to Janet Barry, Superintendent of the Issaquah School District regarding a Strategic District Communications Plan.
- Exhibit 12** The 1999-2000 Strategic District Communications Plan for the Issaquah School District, and a November 29, 1999, cover letter from Ms. Passinetti.
- Exhibit 13** A memorandum dated January 21, 1999, from Denise Passinetti to Janet Barry regarding the Scope of Work being revised for the Strategic District Communications Plan.

- Exhibit 14** The Schedule A attachments to C-4 reports filed by the Volunteers for Issaquah Schools levy committee disclosing committee expenditures.
- Exhibit 15** The February 1999 edition of the “Focus”, a publication produced and distributed by the Issaquah School District.
- Exhibit 16** A publication entitled “Capital bond and Technology levy: The basics” produced and distributed by the Issaquah School District.
- Exhibit 17** A publication entitled “Multi-Track 101, How it might work in Issaquah” produced and distributed by the Issaquah School District.